

REMARKS

Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for considering the present application. In the Office Action dated August 5, 2005, Claims 1-23 are pending in the application. Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

Claims 1-8, 16 and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Schleiss* (6,298,454) in view of *Williams* (5,754,451) and *Dallal* (www.tufts.edu/~gdallal/plots.htm). Claims 9-14, 18, 20 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over *Schleiss* (6,298,454) in view of *Williams* (5,754,451) and *Dallal* in further view of *Taguchi* (5,807,256).

Claim 1 is directed to a diagnostic system for a data acquisition system that includes a computer controller coupled to the data acquisition system, a display device coupled to the computer controller. The computer controller receives data from the data acquisition system, diagnosing a problem in response to said data. The controller generates a screen display corresponding to a schematic representation of the data acquisition system. The controller generates screen indicia on the display device corresponding to a location of the problem on the schematic representation of the data acquisition system. Claim 1 recites that the controller generates a second screen display comprising a boxplot illustrating normalized raw data. This is illustrated in Figure 3 and is described in paragraph 18. The boxplot display is not taught or suggested in either the *Schleiss* or *Williams* reference. The Examiner agrees on page 3 of the Office Action.

The Examiner cites the *Dallal* reference for a boxplot. Applicants admit that a boxplot exists in the *Dallal* reference. However, what is not taught or suggested in any of the references is the combination of a diagnostic system that generates a screen display corresponding to a boxplot illustrating normal raw data corresponding to the schematic representation. The *Dallal* reference merely shows boxplots and not any type of display or diagnostic system. Therefore, no teaching or motivation exists in any of the references for the combination set forth by the Examiner. In fact, Applicants respectfully submit that this is a clear case of hindsight reconstruction of the invention.

Claim 7 is believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth in Claim 1.

Claim 16 is directed to a method that contains similar limitations with respect to the schematic representation of the data acquisition system and the screen indicia and the boxplot. Therefore, Claim 16 is also believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above. Likewise, Claims 2-6 are also believed to be allowable since they are dependent upon allowable independent claims. Therefore, as the teachings of the claims are not found in the combination

of the *Schleiss* and *Williams* references, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner for reconsideration.

The remaining dependent claims are believed to be allowable for the same reasons set forth above. *Taguchi* also does not teach a normalized boxplot.

Claims 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schleiss* and *Williams* in view of *Howards Korritzinsky* (6,598,011). Claims 6 and 15 recite further limitations to Claims 1 and 15 relative to a web browser and a controller generating screen indicia through the web browser. The *Howards Korritzinsky* reference does not teach or suggest the use of a boxplot nor the use of a schematic representation. Applicants therefore respectfully submit that these claims are also allowable for the same reasons set forth above with respect to Claims 1 and 7.

Applicants respectfully believe that all rejections are overcome. Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments, the Examiner is directed to contact the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,



Kevin G. Mierzwa
Registration No. 88,049
Attorney for Applicants

Date: 11-3-2005

Artz & Artz, PC
28333 Telegraph Road, Suite 250
Southfield, Michigan 48034
(248) 223-9500